UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/020,343	12/10/2001	Thomas Bergstraesser	MICRO0256	8983

27792 7590 02/22/2006

RONALD M. ANDERSON
MICROSOFT CORPORATION
600 108TH AVENUE N.E., SUITE 507
BELLEVUE, WA 98004

EXAMINER	
WOZNIAK, JAMES S	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2655	

DATE MAILED: 02/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/020,343	BERGSTRAESSER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	James S. Wozniak	2655	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05 December 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-45* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-45* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *10 December 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. In response to the office action from 8/22/2005, the applicant has submitted an amendment, filed 12/5/2005, amending claims 1, 7, 12, 16, 28-29, 34, and 45, while arguing to traverse the art rejection based on the limitation regarding automatically carrying out an action associated with a tag *(Amendment, Pages 12-14)*. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, however the previous rejection is maintained due to the reasons listed below in the response to arguments.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the following reasons:

The applicant argues that claims 14-15, 27, and 43 are in proper dependent form, further stating that they are of a "Beauregard claim" type *(Amendment, Page 10)*. In response, the examiner notes that while claims 14-15 may be of a proper dependency with respect to a computer readable medium containing a program for implementing a method of an independent claim, claims 14-15 would still fail the infringement test due to the exclusion of essential steps of the claims upon which they depend (steps b and a, c, and d, respectively). Thus, the improper

dependent claim objection has been maintained for claims 14-15, while the improper claim objection for claims 27 and 43 has been withdrawn.

The objection to claim 13 as being of improper dependent form was erroneous and has been withdrawn.

With respect to **Claim 1**, the applicant argues that Allen et al *(U.S. Patent: 6,026,410)* fails to teach automatically carrying out an action in response to an identified tag *(Amendment, Pages 12-14)*. In response, the examiner notes that Allen teaches a means for performing parsing on a natural language text to form tokens *(Col. 5, Line 57- Col. 6, Line 11)* (step a), providing a plurality of keyword identifiers and triggers having associated linking actions (links to contacts, calendar events, projects, etc.) stored in a keyword definition table (Fig. 12, Elements 852 and 854) (step b), comparing keywords in an input text to the keyword identifiers for link generation *(finding related contact information, calendar events, projects, etc, Col. 7, Lines 1-32; matching operation, Col. 12, Line 46- Col. 13, Line 64)* (step c), and automatically creating and opening a link associated with an item in a keyword definition table, wherein the keynote can distinctively display the link itself *(automatically setting links in response to keynote processing and changing font, color, etc. of a keyword within a keynote document, Col. 7, Lines 1-44)* (step d). Thus, as a result of the comparison of a keyword within a keynote document to a keyword definition item, an action associated with the keyword definition (associated link generation) is carried out automatically *(Col. 7, Lines 1-8)*. Also, as is required by the currently amended claims, Allen discloses that the action (link generation) exhibits a behavior in the document by distinctively displaying the link within a keynote (Col. 7, Lines 22-32). Thus, for at least the above reasons, Allen anticipates the invention presently claimed in claim 1.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies *(i.e., spreadsheet related processing and what is specifically meant by the claims "actions", Amendment, Page 13)* are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In regards to the applicants arguments directed towards claims 16 and 28 (Amendment, Page 16), see the above response to the claim 1 arguments.

With respect to Claim 39, the applicant argues that Allen and Ho et al (U.S. Patent: 5,836,771) fail to teach storing tags and actions at a site centrally accessible by a plurality of users *(Amendment, Page 17)*. In response, the examiner notes that it is the combination of Allen and Ho that teaches the aforementioned limitation. As noted above, Allen teaches a keyword definition dictionary table featuring keywords and associated links *(catalog)*, while Ho teaches the concept of storing dictionary/table data at a network server *(Col. 9, Lines 24-31)* for the benefit of conserving memory at a client computer by utilizing client/server communications *(Col. 4, Lines 14-28)*. Thus, for at least the above reasons, claim 39 remains rejected. Also, applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

With respect to Claim 44, the applicant argues that Goldberg et al (U.S. Patent: 6,598,046) fails to teach the claimed "actions" *(Amendment, Page 18)*. In response, the examiner notes that Goldberg does, in fact, disclose an action in the form of retrieving and

displaying documents related to specific data tags *(Col. 8, Line 22- Col. 10, Line 55)*. Thus, since Goldberg teaches an action in the form of displaying documents related to specific data tags and the claimed "action" has not been specifically defined in the claim language, claim 44 remains rejected.

The dependent claims are argued as further limiting rejected independent claims *(Amendment, Page 15)*, and thus, also remain rejected.

Claim Objections

3. **Claims 14-15** are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

The infringement test for determining a proper dependent claim as per the MPEP 608.01 (n), Section III, states that a such a claim cannot conceivably be infringed by anything that would not also infringe the claim it references. In this case, the computer memory medium of claims 14-15 would not infringe the method steps of Claim 1 since the memory mediums of claims 14 and 15 exclude essential steps of the claim upon which they depend (steps b and a, c, and d, respectively).

Thus, Claims 14-15 are improper dependent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. **Claims 1-2, 5-7, and 13-15** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Allen et al *(U.S. Patent: 6,026,410)*.

With respect to **Claim 1**, Allen discloses:

Parsing a text entry made by a user in the document to identify at least one linguistic component of the text entry *(performing parsing on a natural language input text to identify keywords, Col. 5, Line 57- Col. 6, Line 11)*;

Providing a plurality of tags, each of the plurality of tags having an action associated with it *(trigger and keyword identifiers, Col. 12, Lines 13-45; Fig. 12)*;

Comparing the at least one linguistic component to the plurality of tags to determine at least one tag that corresponds to each linguistic component *(matching operation, Col. 12, Line 46- Col. 13, Line 64)*.

Automatically carrying out the action associated with the at least one tag, wherein the action exhibits at least one behavior in the document *(automatically setting links in response to keynote processing and changing font, color, etc. of a keyword within a keynote document, Col. 7, Lines 1-44; Fig. 4A-B, 5-7)*.

With respect to **Claim 2**, Allen teaches multiple identified keywords within a keynote and displayed links corresponding to the keywords for user selection *(Col. 7, Lines 16-44; Fig. 7)*.

With respect to **Claim 5**, Allen further discloses:

Specifying each of the plurality of tags as linguistic annotations (keyword identifier), and synonyms thereof *(types of lists, projects, and contacts representing the keyword identifier) (Fig. 12; Col. 12, Lines 13-45)*;

Defining the actions associated with each of the plurality of linguistic annotations (definition link, Fig. 12, Element 852; Fig. 7);

Creating a tag catalog that includes the linguistic annotations, synonyms, and actions for the plurality of tags in a semantic modeling format *(object dictionary, Fig. 12; Col. 12, Lines 5-45)*.

With respect to **Claim 6**, Allen further discloses a keynote region of a user interface *(Fig. 4A, Element 220; Fig. 6, Element 220; Col. 7, Line 45- Col. 8, Line 21)* associated with the set of tags from the object dictionary as applied to Claim 5.

With respect to **Claim 7**, Allen further recites inputting links for identified tags into shadow region and drop down list portions of a user interface *(Col. 7, Line 45- Col. 8, Line 50; Fig. 4B, Elements 230 and 260)*.

With respect to **Claims 13-15**, Allen discloses method implementation as a program stored on a computer readable medium *(Col. 4, Line 60- Col. 5, Line 7)*.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 3-4 and 10** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen et al in view of Goldberg et al *(U.S. Patent: 6,598,046)*.

With respect to **Claim 3**, Allen teaches the text parsing and tag identification method as applied to Claim 1. Allen does not specifically teach determining a user dependent context as a function of a current user of an application and enabling specific tags to be accessed by that user, however Goldberg discloses document tags that are only accessible based on a user role *(Col. 4, Line 56- Col. 5, Line 38)*.

Allen and Goldberg are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in language processing for document retrieval. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Allen with the user specific document tags as taught by Goldberg in order to implement a means for document retrieval that aligns more closely with the needs an strategies of an individual user *(Goldberg, Col. 2, Lines 31-43)*.

With respect to **Claim 4**, Goldberg further discloses document tag access based upon a particular scenario *(Col. 6, Lines 25-52)*.

With respect to **Claim 10**, Goldberg teaches document tag access as applied to Claim 3, wherein each document has an associated set of tags.

8. **Claims 8-9** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen et al in view of Budzinski et al *(U.S. Patent: 5,715,468)*.

With respect to **Claim 8**, Allen teaches the text parsing and tag identification method that utilizes an object dictionary as applied to Claims 1 and 5. Allen does not specifically suggest a parsing operation that produces a normalized tree of the text entry, however, Budzinski discloses a natural language parsing method that creates a parse tree of an input text for dictionary comparison *(Col. 4, Line 60- Col. 5, Line 22; and Col. 33, Lines 17-51)*.

Allen and Budzinski are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in language processing utilizing text parsing. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Allen with the parsing method taught by Budzinski in order to implement improved natural language processing by further analyzing the role of a word within an input text through the use of a parsing tree *(Budzinski, Col. 20, Lines 12-17)*.

With respect to **Claim 9**, Allen further discloses presenting multiple tags to a user for selection *(Col. 7, Lines 16-44; Fig. 7)*.

9. **Claims 11-12, 39-41, and 43** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen et al in view of Ho et al *(U.S. Patent: 5,836,771)*.

With respect to **Claims 11 and 12**, Allen teaches the text parsing and tag identification method that utilizes an object dictionary as applied to Claims 1 and 5. Allen does not specifically teach dictionary processing at a server, however Ho teaches dictionary processing that takes place at a server *(Col. 9, Lines 24-31)*.

Allen and Ho are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in language processing utilizing text parsing. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Allen with the use of a server having a dictionary as taught by Ho in order to conserver memory at a client computer by utilizing client/server communications *(Ho, Col. 4, Lines 14-28)*.

With respect to **Claim 39**, Allen discloses:

Creating a dictionary that includes linguistic constructs and other metadata relating to natural text that can be entered by a user to activate tags from within the document *(data types, Figs. 7 and 12; entering data into a dictionary, Col. 12, Lines 21-24; and object descriptions, Col. 23, Lines 16-35; Fig. 17)*;

In respect to a template from which the document is produced, associating an action with each tag that can thus be activated *(Col. 7, Lines 16-44; Fig. 12; Col. 12, Lines 5-45)*;

Storing the tags and actions associated with the tags (Col. 12, Lines 5-45; Fig. 12);

Enabling users to produce a document based upon the template, using a productivity software application *(Col. 7, Lines 16-44; Fig. 7)*; and

Providing the dictionary, tags, and actions associated with the tags in respect to the template to a user who is working on the document in the productivity software application, to enable the text entered by the user to be recognized as corresponding to one of the tags, so that

the actions associated with one of the tags is carried out in the document (*object dictionary, Fig. 12; Col. 12, Lines 5-45; displaying a link and opening a selected object, Col. 7, Lines 16-44; Fig. 4A-B, 5-7; Fig. 7).*

Allen does not specifically teach dictionary processing at a server, however Ho teaches dictionary processing that takes place at a server *(Col. 9, Lines 24-31).*

Allen and Ho are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in language processing utilizing text parsing. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Allen with the use of a server having a dictionary as taught by Ho in order to conserver memory at a client computer by utilizing client/server communications *(Ho, Col. 4, Lines 14-28).*

With respect to **Claim 40**, Allen teaches multiple identified keywords within a keynote and displayed links corresponding to the keywords for user selection *(Col. 7, Lines 16-44; Fig. 7)* and the use of a keyword dictionary *(Fig. 12).*

Claim 41 contains subject matter similar to Claim 2, and thus, is rejected for the same reasons.

With respect to **Claim 43**, Allen discloses method implementation as a program stored on a computer readable medium *(Col. 4, Line 60- Col. 5, Line 7).*

10. **Claims 16-18, 20-21, 23-24, 27-30, 32-33, and 35-36** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen et al in view of Kanaegami et al *(U.S. Patent: 5,297,039).*

With respect to **Claim 16**, Allen discloses:

Parsing a text entry made by a user in the document to identify any key words and key phrases included therein *(performing parsing on a natural language input text to identify keywords, Col. 5, Line 57- Col. 6, Line 11)*;

Comparing key words and key phrases to words and phrases included in a predefined dictionary *(matching operation, Col. 12, Line 13- Col. 13, Line 64)*;

Returning instances for any corresponding match and automatically causing an action associated with the instance to be implemented in the document *(automatically setting links in response to keynote processing and changing font, color, etc. of a keyword within a keynote document, Col. 7, Lines 1-44; Fig. 4A-B, 5-7)*.

Allen does not specifically suggest identifying synonyms of an input text, however, Kanaegami discloses a method for identifying synonyms of input text *(Col. 15, Line 55- Col. 16, Line 24; Col. 26, Lines 11-37)*.

Allen and Kanaegami are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in document retrieval applications utilizing text parsing. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Allen with the synonym searching means as taught by Kanaegami in order to ensure no relative terms are overlooked when performing a dictionary matching *(Kanaegami, Col. 1, Lines 48-53)*.

Claim 17 contains subject matter similar to Claim 2, and thus, is rejected for the same reasons.

With respect to **Claim 18**, Allen teaches the entry of a link in a document that is related to a user input (Col. 7, Lines 16-44; Fig. 7).

With respect to **Claim 20**, Allen teaches different links associated with various documents accessible via entered key words and phrases (Figs. 7 and 12).

With respect to **Claim 21**, Allen teaches deriving links in a document from a keyword dictionary *(Figs. 7 and 12; Col. 7, Lines 16-44, Col. 12, Lines 13-45)*.

With respect to **Claim 23**, Allen teaches multiple identified keywords within a keynote and displayed links corresponding to the keywords for user selection *(Col. 7, Lines 16-44; Fig. 7)*.

With respect to **Claim 24**, Allen discloses:

Enabling the user to add additional words and phrases associated with specific instances to the dictionary to create a user lexicon *(Col. 12, Lines 21-24)*.

With respect to **Claim 27**, Allen further discloses method implementation as a program stored on a computer readable medium *(Col. 4, Line 60- Col. 5, Line 7)*.

With respect to **Claim 28**, Allen discloses:

A user input device enabling text to be input by a user *(Fig. 1, Element 122)*;

A display on which the document is displayed *(Fig. 1, Element 121)*;

A memory in which a plurality of machine instructions are stored (Fig. 1, Element 104); and

A processing device coupled to the user input device, the memory, and the display *(Fig. 1, Element 102)*, said processing device executing the machine instructions to carry out a plurality of functions, including:

Parsing a text entry made by a user in the document to identify any key words and key phrases included therein *(performing parsing on a natural language input text to identify keywords, Col. 5, Line 57- Col. 6, Line 11)*;

Comparing key words and key phrases to words and phrases included in a predefined dictionary *(matching operation, Col. 12, Line 13- Col. 13, Line 64)*;

Returning instances for any corresponding match and automatically causing an action associated with the instance to be implemented in the document *(automatically setting links in response to keynote processing and changing font, color, etc. of a keyword within a keynote document, Col. 7, Lines 1-44; Fig. 4A-B, 5-7)*.

Allen does not specifically suggest identifying synonyms of an input text, however, Kanaegami discloses a means for identifying synonyms of input text *(Col. 15, Line 55- Col. 16, Line 24; Col. 26, Lines 11-37)*.

Allen and Kanaegami are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in document retrieval applications utilizing text parsing. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Allen with the synonym searching means as taught by Kanaegami in order to ensure no relative terms are overlooked when performing a dictionary matching *(Kanaegami, Col. 1, Lines 48-53)*.

Claim 29 contains subject matter similar to Claim 2, and thus, is rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 30 contains subject matter similar to Claim 18, and thus, is rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 32 contains subject matter similar to Claim 20, and thus, is rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 33 contains subject matter similar to Claim 21, and thus, is rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 35 contains subject matter similar to Claim 23, and thus, is rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 36 contains subject matter similar to Claim 24, and thus, is rejected for the same reasons.

11. **Claims 19 and 31** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen et al in view of Kanaegami et al, and further in view of Goldberg et al.

With respect to **Claims 19 and 31**, Allen in view of Kanaegami teaches the text parsing and tag identification method and system as applied to Claims 16 and 28. Allen in view of Kanaegami does not specifically teach determining a user dependent context as a function of a current user of an application and enabling specific tags to be accessed by that user, however Goldberg discloses document tags that are only accessible based on a user role *(Col. 4, Line 56-Col. 5, Line 38)*.

Allen, Kanaegami, and Goldberg are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in language processing for document retrieval. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Allen in view of Kanaegami with the user specific document tags as taught by Goldberg in order to

implement a means for document retrieval that aligns more closely with the needs an strategies of an individual user *(Goldberg, Col. 2, Lines 31-43)*.

12. **Claims 22, 25, 34, and 37** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen et al in view of Kanaegami et al, and further in view of Budzinski et al.

With respect to **Claims 22 and 34,** Budzinski discloses parsing trees as applied to Claim 8, having grammatical rules *(Col. 33, Lines 17-51)*.

Allen, Kanaegami, and Budzinski are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in language processing utilizing text parsing. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Allen in view of Kanaegami with the parsing method taught by Budzinski in order to implement improved natural language processing by further analyzing the role of a word within an input text through the use of a parsing tree *(Budzinski, Col. 20, Lines 12-17)*.

With respect to **Claims 25 and 37**, Allen in view of Kanaegami teaches the text parsing and tag identification method that utilizes an object dictionary as applied to Claims 5, 16, and 28. Allen in view of Kanaegami does not specifically suggest a parsing operation that produces a normalized tree of the text entry, however, Budzinski discloses a natural language parsing method that creates a parse tree of an input text for dictionary comparison *(Col. 4, Line 60- Col. 5, Line 22; and Col. 33, Lines 17-51)*.

Allen, Kanaegami, and Budzinski are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in language processing utilizing text parsing. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Allen in

view of Kanaegami with the parsing method taught by Budzinski in order to implement improved natural language processing by further analyzing the role of a word within an input text through the use of a parsing tree *(Budzinski, Col. 20, Lines 12-17)*.

13. **Claims 26 and 38** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen et al in view of Kanaegami et al, and further in view of Ho et al.

With respect to **Claim 26**, Allen in view of Kanaegami teaches the text parsing and tag identification method that utilizes an object dictionary as applied to Claims 5 and 16. Allen in view of Kanaegami does not specifically teach dictionary processing at a server, however Ho teaches dictionary processing that takes place at a server *(Col. 9, Lines 24-31)*.

Allen, Kanaegami, and Ho are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in language processing utilizing text parsing. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Allen in view of Kanaegami with the use of a server having a dictionary as taught by Ho in order to conserve memory at a client computer by utilizing client/server communications *(Ho, Col. 4, Lines 14-28)*.

Claim 38 contains subject matter similar to Claim 26, and thus, is rejected for the same reasons. Allen also teaches the use of HTML for displaying text *(Col. 30, Lines 44-53)*.

14. **Claim 42** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen et al in view of Ho et al, and further in view of Goldberg et al.

With respect to **Claim 42**, Allen in view of Ho teaches the text parsing and tag identification method and system as applied to Claim 39. Allen in view of Ho does not specifically teach determining a user dependent context as a function of a current user of an application and enabling specific tags to be accessed by that user, however Goldberg discloses document tags that are only accessible based on a user role *(Col. 4, Line 56- Col. 5, Line 38)*.

Allen, Ho, and Goldberg are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in language processing utilizing text parsing. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Allen in view of Ho with the user specific document tags as taught by Goldberg in order to implement a means for document retrieval that aligns more closely with the needs an strategies of an individual user *(Goldberg, Col. 2, Lines 31-43)*.

15. **Claim 44** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldberg et al in view of Carter et al *(U.S. Patent: 6,108,619)*.

With respect to **Claim 44**, Goldberg discloses:

A memory in which machine instructions and data are stored, said data including a plurality of tags and actions associated with the tags in regard to a template on which the document is based *(processor and associated memory, Col. 5, Lines 39-56; metadata, Col. 6, Line 53- Col. 7, Line 6)*;

A processing device that is coupled in communication with the memory *(Fig. 1, Element 22)*, said processing device executing the machine instructions stored in the memory to carry out a plurality of functions, including:

Enabling the tags and actions associated with the tags to be centrally maintained *(maintaining tags and metadata at a central data repository, Col. 4, Line 56- Col. 5, Line 3; and Fig. 1, Element 20)*;

Enabling any of a plurality of remote computing devices to access and download the tags and actions associated with the tags for use in carrying out the action associated with any tag that corresponds to text entered in the document *(Col. 8, Line 22- Col. 10, Line 55)*.

Goldberg does not explicitly disclose a network interface connecting a plurality of remote computing devices over a network, however Carter discloses such an implementation *(Col. 2, Lines 49-61; Fig. 1)*.

Goldberg and Carter are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in text searching systems utilizing metadata. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Goldberg with the client/server implementation as taught by Carter in order to provide the ability for multiple computer systems to share data *(Carter, Col. 2, Lines 49-61)*.

16. **Claim 45** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldberg et al in view of Carter et al, and further in view of Fukao et al *(U.S. Patent: 5,323,311)*.

With respect to **Claim 45**, Goldberg in view of Carter teaches the metadata providing system as applied to Claim 44. Carter further teaches a token dictionary *(Col. 4, Lines 26-67)*. Goldberg in view of Carter does not specifically suggest the ability to download a dictionary at a client device, however Fukao teaches such an implementation *(Col. 9, Lines 45-51)*.

Goldberg, Carter, and Fukao are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in text processing systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary

skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Goldberg in view of Carter with the dictionary transfer means as taught by Fukao in order to allow multiple user terminals to share dictionary data *(Fukao, Col. 9, Lines 45-51)*.

Conclusion

17. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

18. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Namba et al *(U.S. Patent: 5,555,169)*- teaches a means for performing an action associated with an input natural language text command.

Richardson et al *(U.S. Patent: 6,278,996)*- teaches a means for generating actions in response to a text message.

Shanahan et al *(U.S. Patent: 6,820,075)*- teaches a means for performing an auto-completion operation that utilizes metadata.

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James S. Wozniak whose telephone number is (571) 272-7632. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th, 7:30-5:00, F, 7:30-4, Off Alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Hudspeth can be reached at (571) 272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James S. Wozniak
2/7/2006

DAVID HUDSPETH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600